



Media History

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cmeh20>

Media History and Media Studies: Aspects of the development of the study of media history in the UK 1945-2000

Tom O'Malley

Published online: 19 Aug 2010.

To cite this article: Tom O'Malley (2002) Media History and Media Studies: Aspects of the development of the study of media history in the UK 1945-2000, Media History, 8:2, 155-173, DOI: [10.1080/1368880022000030522](https://doi.org/10.1080/1368880022000030522)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1368880022000030522>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any

form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Media History and Media Studies: aspects of the development of the study of media history in the UK 1945–2000

TOM O'MALLEY, *University of Wales, Aberystwyth*

The history of comment and research on and analysis of the media has never been fully charted. [1]

Historians at work in the UK in 1945 did not use the phrase 'media history' or 'communications history' to describe a particular area of study. There were histories of the press, but little sense of the press being a central part of history broadly conceived, nor of their being a wider set of important concerns about the historical influence of the media or communications on social and political development. By 2000 this had changed. The study of the history of individual media forms was reasonably well developed, and academics were willing to use terms like media history as a way of describing their activity in a manner inconceivable in 1945. This was the result of a slow realization by academics that the mass media and communications were pervasive elements of nineteenth- and twentieth-century societies and as such had to move from the margins towards the centre of historical investigation. Yet the process was uneven.

The study of media history emerged slowly after 1945 from a number of contexts, and it is one purpose of this article to describe some of these. It traces the competing influences of sociology, history, literary and cultural studies on discussions about how the media should be studied. It argues that the tensions between empirically focused and theoretically focused, synchronic and asynchronic methods of enquiry that existed within and between sociology and history in particular influenced how academics approached the study of the media and its history. It also argues that interest in media history has emerged from a range of disciplinary perspectives such that interdisciplinarity was a defining, if not fully developed, characteristic of the area at the end of the twentieth century.

After discussing aspects of the relationship between the social sciences and history, the article focuses on debates within media studies in the UK and on the development of historically informed sociological work on media policy in the UK after 1945. It then discusses the way historians thought about and practised their craft, and the way changes in these practices facilitated the development of historical studies of the media in the UK. Finally, it traces post-1945 commentary, on the study of the history of the media in the UK, pointing to the way interdisciplinary approaches to the study of media history played an important part in the way practitioners conceived of the area [2].

History and the Social Sciences

Media studies emerged in the UK, from a wide range of disciplinary sites some of which are discussed below [3], but has always stood in a close relation to the social sciences.

The social sciences have, historically, been criticized by practitioners from within the area and by historians looking in. These criticisms have reflected tensions about how best to study social processes and social change, and they have, in turn provided a context within which thought about how to study the media have been framed. Peter Burke has summarized some of these tensions:

In Britain, at least, many historians still regard sociologists as people who state the obvious in a barbarous and abstract jargon, lack any sense of place and time, squeeze individuals without mercy into rigid categories and, to cap it all describe these activities as 'scientific'. Sociologists, for their part, have long viewed historians as amateurish, myopic fact-collectors without system or method, the imprecision of their 'data base' matched only by their incapacity to analyse it. [4]

There is a long history to these kinds of issues in which, from the eighteenth century onwards various currents of opinion have held sway amongst historians and social scientists. The founding figures of twentieth-century sociology, Weber, Pareto and Durkheim, 'were all read in history' but 'the next generation of social theorists' from the 1920s onwards 'turned away from the past' [5]. The development of sociology as an academic discipline thereafter was accompanied by a sharpening of distinctions between sociologists and historians. Sociologists, particularly in the USA had lost, according to C. Wright Mills in 1959, a sense of the importance of history. He argued that:

every social science—or better, every well considered social study—requires a historical scope of conception and full use of historical materials.

For Mills, the style of social research he was criticizing

seems to consist of efforts to restate and adopt philosophies of natural science in such a way as to form a programme and canon for work in social science. [6]

These criticisms were also voiced in the UK. Writing in 1957 the historian A.J.P. Taylor considered 'sociology is history with the history left out' [7]. Similarly, in 1971, John Goldthorpe attacked the theories of Talcott Parson on the grounds that they 'gave no clear indication of the nature of the connection between the immediate historical world, in which individuals and groups pursue their interests ... and the emergence of the theoretically intelligible regularities that are postulated' [8].

There was no period in which historians and social scientists lost touch and the flow between history and social theory intensified in the 1960s and 1970s, particularly with the growing influence of sociology, anthropology and Marxism in historical studies [9]. Yet tensions remained. Writing in 1980 Philip Abrams noted the benefits that arose from the tension between the two areas:

The whole conception of convergence, of the two disciplines usefully learning from one another and progressively dissolving into a blissful social history, is too simple and too bland to do justice to a tangled, difficult relationship which is actually productive just because it is tense, distanced and complicated, because it is built on antithesis as well as on a community of interest. In one sense history and sociology invoke logics of explanation which simply cannot be integrated—although they can be constructively defined.

In contrast to Anthony Giddens' position, argued in 1979, that there 'simply are no logical distinctions between the social sciences and history—appropriately conceived', Abrams thought that 'in practice it seems to me that historians and sociologists still have

a long way to go in cultivating a common rhetoric that will effectively and adequately express what can readily be seen as their common logic of explanation' [10].

This ambiguity or tension marked discussion about the ways in which communications were theorized in the 1960s and 1990s. Jürgen Habermas' work on the public sphere became an increasingly influential category in media studies. It was a normative conception grounded in a particular reading of the political history of post-Renaissance Europe, and was thus also operating as an historical concept. Although increasingly used by historians, one major problem was that:

the concept of the 'public sphere' is less clear than it looks and ... different periods, different cultures and different social groups ... may well draw the line between public and private in different places. [11]

In fact the rise of the concept as a normative category for use in debates about the public sphere in late modern societies has, arguably, seemed little influenced by the criticism that, historically, the concept is less than clear. Indeed the use to which the concept has been put in academic debates about the media is a good example of the tensions that emerge when history, social theory and media studies meet [12].

Whereas Habermas incorporated communications within his account of the public sphere, John Thompson has pointed out that late twentieth-century social theorists of modernity, notably, Giddens, Mann, Foucault and Bourdieu 'have given relatively little direct and sustained consideration to the nature and impact of communication media in the modern world'. In the face of this he insisted that:

if we wish to understand the cultural transformations associated with the rise of modern societies, then we must give a central role to the development of communication media and their impact. [13]

By the 1990s the relationship between the social sciences, in particular social theory and history, remained marked by disciplinary tensions. The reasons for this are explored by Peter Burke [14] and are discussed, further, below. It is not surprising, therefore, that media studies, which has been strongly influenced by sociology and social theory, should carry this inheritance, these tensions between sometimes connected, oft times separated, styles of knowledge acquisition.

Media Studies in the UK

social theory and the study of communications in particular has its own history. We can only clarify the reasons for studying communications, the questions it raises and the methods appropriate in our attempts to answer them, if we ground our enquiry in the specific intellectual and disciplinary history that brought us to where we are today. [15]

Nicholas Garnham here stresses the importance of understanding the particular history of communication studies. Yet as Asa Briggs and Peter Burke have commented, the 'history of comment and research on and analysis of the media has never been fully charted' [16]. This section traces some of these developments, in particular the tensions that existed within this area between history and social and cultural theory, and between empirically grounded and more abstract ways of studying the media, tensions, which although increasingly recognized in UK media studies in the 1990s, were not resolved.

While it was 'only in the 1920s—according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*—that most people began to speak of "the media"' [17] intellectual interest in mass communi-

cations goes back much further. In the UK there were widespread concerns about the spread of mass printed materials in the nineteenth century [18] and the study of journalism had begun to develop in the UK and the USA by the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries [19]. Intellectual concerns about the 'mass media' in these years were linked to concerns about the emergence of 'mass society' [20] and in the UK there were concerns about the impact of cinema on behaviour and attitudes [21]. As Asa Briggs has noted, the development of audience research from the 1930s onwards 'sprang from an attempt on the part of organised communicators ... to discover facts about their audience either for marketing or for programming purposes or both'. In the UK the BBC began systematic audience research in the 1930s and the critical study of the press grew in vogue in the first 30 years of the century, culminating in the 'first empirical report on the British Press' in 1938 by the Political and Economic Planning group [22]. In the USA empirical, industry and government funded research into the impact of the mass media was established in universities in the 1930s and 1940s [23].

The impulses behind and the forms of research into mass communications were various, but in the UK in the 1940s and 1950s 'very general speculation remained in vogue' [24]. What was to prove a major influence on the academic study of media and culture in the UK was the work of tutors within the Workers Educational Association (WEA). In the 1930s and 1940s, the adult education movement, in which the economic historian R.H. Tawney and the émigré sociologist Karl Mannheim were involved, brought together concerns about the relationship between 'popular culture', literature and sociology. The structure of adult classes in which questions of social history, industrial relations or literature were discussed over extended periods by working people launched for one tutor, Richard Hoggart, 'implicit but powerful challenges to the definition of my subject—English literature' and led him 'to move out to an area I called contemporary cultural studies'. In 1968 the historian, Edward Thompson also noted the importance of the WEA, where historians like G.D.H. Cole, Asa Briggs and Tawney engaged with new forms of social history. Raymond Williams argued in 1989:

we are beginning I am afraid, to see encyclopaedia articles dating the birth of Cultural Studies from this or that book in the late 'fifties. Don't believe a word of it. That shift of perspective about the teaching of arts and literature and their relation to history and contemporary society began in Adult Education, it didn't happen anywhere else.

As the historian of these developments has pointed out, 'the project of cultural studies more properly belongs to the experimentation, interdisciplinarity and political commitment of adult education immediately before and after the Second World War' [25]. Historians like Asa Briggs played a key role in the WEA in the 1950s, acting as President from 1958 to 1967 [26]. As Michael Pickering has pointed out, in these years amongst those interested in culture 'history was widely accepted as a vibrant and critical source of new intellectual work' [27].

The formative influence on early cultural studies was, indeed, English literary criticism, a tradition from which both Raymond Williams and Richard Hoggart came. Hoggart has described how the early impulses, applying 'the methods of literary criticism, very often Leavisite methods, close analysis, listening to a text, feeling a text and its texture' to 'the study of popular culture; and not just the words but the images too' [28]. Hoggart brought this approach with him to the University of Birmingham where, in 1964, he founded the influential Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies and where he hoped to maintain an interdisciplinary approach to the study of culture drawing

on philosophy, literary criticism and history [29]. Hoggart retained this stress on literary critical methods, and it became a pervasive form of analysis within media studies. David Morrison has noted how, when Hoggart chaired the board of the Broadcasting Research Unit in the 1980s, staff had ‘innumerable battles’ with him ‘to have survey research accepted’ and ‘were simply shocked, even unnerved, by the presence of such single-minded belief in a literary approach to knowledge’ [30]. Morrison’s comments represented a reaction to what had, by the late 1970s, become dominant literary and theoretical tendencies in media studies.

The underlying issue here became the status of empirical and historical work in media studies. Empirical sociology and history did play a role in the development of academic interest in media studies, not least of all in the work of Jeremy Tunstall, in the 1960s and 1970s, which included an encouragement of historical work [31]. Raymond Williams, in his books from the 1950s to the 1970s, ‘continuously made reference to the past’ although without displaying the ‘methodological procedures of a trained historian’ [32]. His work was praised, none the less, in 1966, by the BBC’s historian, Asa Briggs, as having ‘detected whole new ways of thinking in terms of communications’ [33]. Williams’ interest in these matters was part also of a wider interest in social and cultural change in the UK in the 1950s and 1960s, which he shared with other members of the New Left, which in turn gave rise to theoretical and empirical work on these topics and which was part of a wider attempt to redefine socialist strategies for the twentieth century [34].

None the less, the social historian E.P. Thompson’s early critique of Raymond Williams’ work focused on his tendency to write history ‘not as a process of struggle and choices but as a “record of impersonal forces”’. In criticizing the emerging academic interest in ‘culture’ Thompson and others were raising concerns about the political implications for the Left of focusing on culture, which they thought involved a retreat from ‘the harsh realities of institutional and class power’ [35]. Here Thompson identified two tendencies within that phase of interest in culture, the abstractions of ‘impersonal forces’ and the absence of an empirical account of the process of struggle. These tendencies dug deeper roots in the 1960s with the growing influence of continental (French, German) critical theory within the New Left, and in particular in the *New Left Review*, an influence which spilled over into media studies in the UK. As Steele has put it:

The ‘culturalism’ which Thompson had encouraged was tempered in his case and that of the ‘old’ New Left by the empirical discipline of submission to historical evidence and material enquiry. But many of the young Turks it encouraged had fewer reservations. Under the newly discovered sign of ‘Theory’ some of the ‘new’ New Left of the early 1960s unlocked the gates to more fully fledged idealism. [36]

By 1979 Thompson was openly attacking a leading figure in the by then heavily theoretical Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Richard Johnson, for carrying these tendencies into an account of the genesis of the New Left’s interest in culture. He accused Johnson of ‘some sloppy and impressionistic history’ [37].

The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies has played a justifiably celebrated role in promoting media studies in the UK. But given the tendencies described above and influence of the New Left and the Centre in promoting theory, it was not surprising that when, in the 1970s and 1980s, as undergraduate courses variously focusing on communications or cultural studies, began to take a footing in UK polytechnics, theory occupied

a privileged place therein. Asa Briggs and Peter Burke have noted how with this expansion:

theory was given a prominent place and ... the wide range of theories on offer frequently did not seem to relate pertinently to the experience of people working in the media. [38]

For David Morrison the prominence of theory was accounted for by 'a rapid influx of people into the field whose background is not social science, but the humanities, drawing heavily on literary and cultural criticism for their analytical approach where theory is pre-eminent' [39].

By the 1980s and 1990s concerns about the theoreticism, lack of empirical methodologies and ahistoricism of much media studies were widespread and the subject of fierce debate. In a wide-ranging critique of media studies in higher education first published in 1981, Nicholas Garnham criticized the area's focus on 'ideology' as 'a-social and a-historical' and enjoined media studies to:

forget notions of its own specificity and re-establish its links with the mainland of the social sciences, the queen of which is history in the robes of historical materialism. [40]

In 1990 James Curran attacked the way in which developments in media studies in the 1980s which concentrated on the role of audiences paid insufficient attention to the history of mass communications research. This produced work which was an:

often repeated, caricature of the history of communications research that writes out a whole generation of researchers. It presents as an innovation what is in reality a process of rediscovery. [41]

Indeed by 1991 Curran believed that 'historical research' was 'the neglected grandparent of media studies' [42].

Hans Fredrik Dahl, attributed this dominance of non-empirical methodology and the neglect of history in media studies to the opposite reason advanced by David Morrison [43]. It was:

partly due to the sociologists having come first, and having done so in great and successful numbers; partly to the fact that historians of the past as well as of the present have grossly neglected the media and still tend to limit their interest in them mainly to the question of their reliability as source material for history proper. [44]

Three years later, Douglas Kellner attributed developments in what was by now a fairly distinctly defined area of Cultural Studies to that subject's 'post-modern turn ... whereby economics, history and politics are decentered', echoing the sense that cultural studies had broken its former links with an empirically orientated approach to knowledge [45]. Michael Pickering also noted that there 'has now developed a wide division between history and cultural studies' with 'social historians and practitioners of cultural studies talking past each other' [46]. David Morrison identified a wider gap, again centred on attitudes to empirical knowledge, asserting that 'One thing that characterises both cultural studies and media studies is their opposition to the methods of quantification' [47]. A similar point was made by Andrew Milner when he argued that precisely:

because Cultural Studies is neither sociology nor history ... it needs to learn to respect the specialist disciplinary competencies of these immediately cognate disciplines. [48]

In the following year Nicholas Garnham returned to this theme, at length, asserting the necessity for media studies to have history at its centre because:

all theories of the media rest upon historical theories as to the process of historical development of media institutions and practices and their relationship to the development of modernity. [49]

So, the wider tensions between social theory and history found echoes in the development of communications, media and cultural studies in the UK after 1945. This was not a simple division between historical and ahistorical approaches. It was also a division around what were the most appropriate tools (literary, philosophical, sociological), and what was the status of empirical relative to theoretical work. Different accounts of developments in media studies in the 1980s and 1990s all share a sense that there had been a drift away from empirically informed work towards too great a stress on theory, and a sense that history had diminished as an important component part of the field. An additional trend in post-1945 media studies was an interest in media policy, largely from within the strands of study influenced by sociology, political economy and history, and it is to these issues that we now turn.

Aspects of the Development of Media Policy Studies

Just as the development of media studies after 1945 was characterized by divergence of methods and a retreat from historically and empirically informed methods, so it was also characterized by a relative marginalization of policy issues. The immediate post-war interest in media policy which informed Richard Hoggart and Raymond Williams was arguably less influential within media studies by the 1980s than in the earlier period.

Prior to 1945 UK governments had engaged in the formulation of policy for the film and broadcasting industries [50]. Politicians, journalists and academics, including Stanley Baldwin, Henry Wickham Steed, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, and Political and Economic Planning had, amongst others, exercised themselves about issues that would now be seen as ‘media policy’ [51]. The decision by the 1945–1950 Labour government to establish the first Royal Commission on the press (1947–1949) was, in part, due to a recognition within the Civil Service that if broadcasting was subject to periodic public inquiry there was no good reason why the press should not also be so examined [52].

In spite of this interest “‘communications research”, particularly university-based research, developed slowly in Britain’ [53]. Asa Briggs’ interests in communications research preceded his decision to write the history of the BBC reflected a developing sense of the importance of communications and culture amongst often left of centre intellectuals during the latter part of the 1950s [54]. This was reflected not only in the emergence of the systematic study of broadcasting history, but also in a direct engagement in policy issues by people who also played an influential role in the creation of media studies, like Hoggart and Williams.

There was a strong interest in the connections between culture, media and education in the 1950s which led, in 1959, to the creation of the Society of Film and Television Teachers. Academics such as David Butler were also developing systematic work on the politics of political broadcasting in the 1950s [55]. Richard Hoggart’s *Uses of Literacy* (1957) unleashed a train of developments which led to him being appointed to the *Committee on Broadcasting* which sat from 1960 to 1962 and was commonly known, after its Chair, as the Pilkington Committee [56]. This body was in Richard Hoggart’s retrospective view ‘the finest statement on broadcasting we have had’ [57]. Raymond

Williams retained a strong commitment to policy issues, as did others associated with the New Left. Drawing heavily on Williams' thought the *New Left Review* made a submission to Pilkington. Michael Kenny has argued that 'the final report produced by the Committee revealed the influence of the New Left's critique of television genres, though it showed less evidence of the radical proposals for democratising this media which the New Left's submission included' [58]. Williams also submitted evidence [59]. By the early 1960s in his book *Communications* (1962), Williams was developing policy for the media as well as providing models for its analysis [60]. In these activities Williams and Hoggart were in a sense echoing Briggs' view, as expressed in his 1960 Fisher Memorial Lecture, that where understanding of the role of mass entertainment was concerned 'there is a need for greater public knowledge and discussion of what is going on and what has already gone on' [61].

During the 1960s and 1970s a strong tradition emerged of individual academics writing on, or engaging in policy issues. Nicholas Garnham was involved, with others, in the work of the Free Communications Group, founded in 1968, which argued for more 'democratic control of all media' [62]. Academics such as Jeremy Tunstall and James Curran were closely involved in media policy work, in and outside of the Labour Party, advising the 1974–1977 Royal Commission on the Press and, in Curran's case, being a founder member of the Campaign for Press Freedom in 1979. Two influential books emerged out of this context: Curran and Seaton's *Power Without Responsibility* (1981) and Tunstall's *The Media in Britain* (1983), both of which placed policy issues in an historical perspective [63]. This tradition of interest and engagement with media policy from within media studies continued into the 1980s and 1990s, the fruits of which often appeared in journals such as *Media, Culture and Society* and the *European Journal of Communications*, and developed, rapidly in the 1980s into considerations of the developments in the media heralded by changes in technology and the political climate in Europe and America.

This was largely a development within that area of the field that had media as its focus. Policy work was not such a strong feature amongst those specialists who defined themselves increasingly as being involved in cultural studies. Towards the end of his life, Raymond Williams 'criticised the current academic practices of cultural studies as having strayed too far from their radical and grounded origins' [64]. During the 1980s the dominant shift in UK media culture was associated with the radical restructuring of broadcasting initiated by the Conservative administrations led by Margaret Thatcher (1979–1983, 1983–1987, 1987–1990) [65]. But there was unease amongst some that, in spite of the volume of courses and academics, policy issues played a relatively minor role in academic practice. Commenting on the seminal 1990 Broadcasting Act [66], Richard Hoggart argued it had created a 'deplorable' situation, undermining public service broadcasting:

And what are academics doing, what are Vice-Chancellors doing, what in fact is the BBC doing about it? They're sitting tight and hoping it will pass over.
[67]

His pessimism, though exaggerated when the policy work described above is considered, was not unfounded. In a wide-ranging and influential critique of the area of cultural studies published in 1992, Jim McGuigan attacked the tendency in the 1980s for specialists in that area to focus on interpreting TV texts and audiences' interpretations of those texts, at the expense of examining public policy:

The major problem with exclusively hermeneutic study of television is its incapacity to engage critically with such issues.

Those engaged in this activity were 'noticeable' in their 'comparative failure ... to intervene constructively in British Broadcasting debates of the 1980s'. Noting what was by then a fairly well established sense of division between areas in the field he argued:

Significantly, political economists of communications and culture were much more critical of Conservative broadcasting policies in the 1980s than were commentators associated with contemporary cultural studies. [68]

Since then there has been a shift towards reorienting aspects of cultural studies towards policy issues; but the fact of division between policy traditions and more hermeneutic approaches was a reality in the field during the 1990s [69].

This, in turn, can be understood as a further manifestation of the tensions that existed between different methods, between those that prioritized theory and those that leaned towards a more empirical approach. Within media studies, interest in media history was expressed by specialists, often with a background in sociology (Tunstall) or history (Curran), who though engaged with theoretical issues helped to develop empirically grounded historical work in the area during the 1970s and 1980s. Within the field of historical studies the development of studies in media history were marked to some extent by similar tensions.

The Changing Foci of History

Just as social theorists in the twentieth century were slow to recognize the importance of communications and media in history [70] so too were historians. As John Tosh has pointed out:

One of the distinguishing features of the profession is its heated arguments concerning the objectives and limitations of historical study.

His conclusion in the face of this debate, writing as he was at the tail end of the twentieth century, was that:

history cannot be defined as either a humanity or a social science without denying a large part of its nature ... History is a hybrid discipline which owes its endless fascination and its complexity to the fact that it straddles the two. [71]

In spite of this truism, there remained in UK historical writing, for much of the twentieth century a 'traditional empiricism and hostility to over conceptualised argument' [72]. This, in part, explains why historians in the UK remained suspicious of the theoretically driven concerns of those interested in communications, media and cultural studies.

Yet interest and awareness of communications printing and culture existed in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century European writings on history. The eighteenth-century writer Concordet integrated the development of printing into his three-part model of phases in human history. The English historian Lord Acton considered, in 1895, that printing:

gave the assurance that the work of the Renaissance would last, that what was written would be accessible to all, that such an occultation of knowledge and ideas as had depressed the Middle Ages would never recur, that not an idea would be lost. [73]

On continental Europe, in spite of a strong suspicion amongst historians influenced by Ranke's focus on documentary evidence, of the social sciences as too unscientific, abstract and general [74], a tradition of exploring cultural history, exemplified by the work of Burkhardt, Pirenne, Huizinga and Bloch developed in the late nineteenth century and first half of the twentieth century [75]. In the UK though, social and cultural history was, for much of the nineteenth century and almost half of the twentieth, under the shadow of Ranke's influential methodology and concerns. Close attention to the extant 'record', usually diplomatic and state records, underpinned a dominant focus on political and constitutional history. This in turn was dominated, until the 1930s and beyond, by a belief in English history as an exemplum of the slow, progressive development of national and personal liberties [76]. These developments coincided with the professionalization of history as it became academically respectable and ensconced in universities [77]. Thus at its birth, professional history in the UK was profoundly influenced by an empiricist methodology, which prioritized a particular type of political history, often constitutional in focus.

The lack of focus on media history can also be attributed to more general ideas about the emergence of the mass media amongst elites in the UK. The social historian, G.M. Trevelyan writing in 1901 considered the printing press had been captured by 'Philistines' [78]. Trevelyan was echoing a much wider distaste amongst intellectuals for the new forms of mass communication and culture emerging at the end of the nineteenth century, a distaste driven by ignorance, disinterest and elitism as well as genuine fears about the consequences of these developments [79]. Also, for much of the century, the historical profession drew to its ranks 'its fair share of conservatives concerned to invoke the sanction of the past in defence of institutions threatened by radical reform' and who were in addition often distrustful of theory. History attracted those of a painstaking turn of mind, interested in fine detail, or, as the conservative historian G.R. Elton put it a 'concern with the particular' [80]. Indeed the emergence of the DPhil as the route into the historical profession, while having the virtue of instilling 'meticulous accuracy' tended, according to Christopher Hill, to 'lead to tunnel vision, to an inability to place events ... in any wider context' [81].

Thus a number of factors had combined to discourage both a wide ranging, theoretically informed style of history in the UK, and within that to discourage a detailed historical focus on the nature and significance of communications systems, particularly print and the press. The emergence of social history in the UK, slowly at first in the 1950s, and more rapidly thereafter, helped to create a climate in which questions of communications and media history could develop. Historians from the left, like Christopher Hill or the centre, like Asa Briggs, began to see social and cultural history as crucial to understanding change—a development in part stimulated by the way social theory had interacted with history and literary studies in the pre- and post-war adult education movement [82]. Briggs has made this explicit, pointing out that by the early 1960s he had 'long been interested in the relationship between sociology and history ... and I wanted to relate "culture" to both social and economic history' [83]. The background to these developments are traced elsewhere [84], but there can be little doubt that the break with politically orientated, empirically dominated constitutional history into a more theoretical informed style of history, and with it the opportunities of examining new historical problems, facilitated the emergence of studies on media and communications history. In addition, as has already been noted, in the late 1950s and the 1960s, the sheer scale of changes in society, bound up as they were with the spread of the mass media,

was stimulating wider intellectual interest in questions of communications and culture [85].

By the 1960s and 1970s systematic work on the media, print and broadcasting included, was being undertaken by people in the USA and the UK, with an explicit commitment to using theory from the social sciences as well as with a concern for the particular [86]. This took place within the context of an expansion in the foci of historical studies, which began to include historical studies of gender, class, race, social memory, literacy and culture, which in its own way was as heterogeneous in approach and theoretical concern as the emerging field of media, communication and cultural studies in UK polytechnics. History also, somewhat laggardly, became beset by the same problems of theory, and its consequent problematizing of historical realism, that beset media and cultural studies [87].

None the less problems remained. Briggs has noted how he has:

spent a great deal of my time and energy in writing the history of broadcasting ... sometimes to the express regret of several of my historian colleagues who have argued that I might have been better employed elsewhere. [88]

This reflects, arguably, a continuing distance between historians and the status they accord to the study of the media. As late as 2000, John Tosh was allocating film to the category of 'the range of sources in which historians claim expertise', and newspapers as 'sources' for political and social views, day to records of events, and repositories of 'thorough enquiries into issues which lie beyond the scope of routine news-reporting'. Understanding film and the press as part of evolving patterns of the circulation of meaning and articulation of social and cultural power in society does not figure in this approach. Why? Well, in the otherwise exemplary description of historical methods offered by Tosh, he regards 'books, broadsheets and newspapers' as 'no substitute for the direct, day-to-day evidence of thought and action provided by the letter, the diary and the memorandum: these are the records of history *par excellence*'. Such a view discounts questions of what role the meanings presented in print conveyed and played in short and longer term processes of change and asserts a rigid hierarchy of sources seemingly independent of the questions being asked. Tosh's position reflects a relatively restricted view of what the 'records' of the media can tell us about historical change [89].

By the 1990s the foci of historical study in the UK had developed and historians were much more used to utilizing theory from a variety of sources and working on a much wider range of topics than had been the case up to the 1950s and 1960s. This provided the conditions in which media history developed in the UK.

Media History

Histories of the press, largely from an internal perspective, stressing the growth of press freedom existed from the nineteenth century onwards [90]. While the historian, H.A.L. Fisher writing in 1939 regarded the BBC's weekly magazine *The Listener* as something future historians would use as 'a guide to the multiple and changing interests and activities of the age', it took some time, as has been shown, for systematic study of the media by historians to emerge [91]. As Philip Taylor has put it:

Historians themselves were sceptical at first about the value of television. From the late 1950s onwards, when television was maturing as a medium ... historians—like many academics generally—did not even possess a TV set, regarding it as unworthy of attention. [92]

Paul Smith noted also how one reason for the relative neglect of film by historians in the 1940s and 1950s 'has undoubtedly been the conservatism which affects all professions, in which acquired wisdom may find itself consorting uncomfortably with sloth and narrow-mindedness' [93].

A similar neglect of broadcasting history has been observed by Briggs. In 1960, in arguing for a broad approach to the study of communications he noted that: 'The provision of entertainment has never been a subject of great interest either to economists or to economic historians' [94]. Indeed when the first volume of his history of British broadcasting was published in the following year he argued that:

there were few general histories of broadcasting in any country ... Several books on broadcasting institutions had already appeared, some of which included brief historical sections ... There were few attempts at synthesis, however.

From the start Briggs attempted to widen the focus of his history beyond a narrow concern with institutions, drawing on sociology, seeking to develop a contribution to cultural history and, consciously, citing Raymond Williams' *Culture and Society*, thus making a link he continued to develop between history and the theoretical issues emerging from media studies [95]. Subsequently he continued to place broadcasting history within the framework of communications history, arguing in 1966 that, 'in the age of printing we can trace the emergence of a number of key issues of control which have been posed once again in more recent communications history—issues, for example, of monopoly, of licensing and of censorship' and pointing to just 'how intricate and complex is the relationship between technological and social history' [96].

His efforts to keep broadcasting history as both discrete yet part of a wider social history, of which other media were also a key component, occurred at the same time as historians began to think about and use film and film history, more systematically. In the early 1960s Nicholas Pronay at Leeds was 'one of the first historians in Britain to research and teach what was then considered ... somewhat tangential to mainstream history'. The interest was there and was expressed in the foundation of the Inter-University History Film Consortium in 1968, of which Pronay was a founder member [97]. Discussion proceeded in the 1960s about how best historians could make use of film and of the problems of using it as evidence. In 1965 Christopher Roads of the Imperial War Museum, in a discussion of the way historians could approach film, argued that:

the value and use of film as historical evidence can be appreciated only if the prospective user has a broad grasp of the circumstances surrounding its creation, and accessibility, as well as of its general character, and therefore, its relationship with other classes of records. [98]

Roads, who was addressing archivists as well as historians, was reflecting a wider growth of interest amongst historians in audio visual archives. At the BBC in the 1970s, more:

historians than ever before ... wished to go to Caversham ... The range and curiosity of historians was widening, and with a more sophisticated sense of what constituted evidence.

As a result the BBC set up an Advisory Committee on Archives in 1975 [99]. Tracing the history of historians' interest in film from hesitant beginnings in the 1950s up to the 1970s, Paul Smith noted in 1976 how much work had been done since the 1960s: 'work

has progressed steadily on all main fronts, investigation of film as source material, use of film in teaching, and making of films for academic purposes'. None the less:

What is needed in the long run is, of course, the full integration of film into the range of resources at the historian's disposal, so that its use, where appropriate is a matter of course, not needing special remark.

He urged on film historians the task of producing studies which 'analyse the content of its relations to society' and to make use of specialized knowledge, such as 'semiology' to help analyse film. In addition, he too stressed the importance of film archives [100]. His thoughts were similar to those of Donald Watt, who argued in the same collection that 'it is intensely important that the new media should be made use of and understood in all their aspects' [101].

The 1960s and 1970s were also a period of burgeoning interest in, and work on, the history of the press. In the 1960s Briggs noted the absence of a serious study of the nineteenth-century UK Sunday press. By the early 1970s work on the nineteenth-century working-class press was emerging [102]. None the less, when in 1978 Boyce, Curran and Wingate published their scholarly collection of essays on the press from the seventeenth century onwards, they were able to assert that:

It is a commonplace to justify the publication of a new book by pointing to the lack of any existing rival in the field; but a book which surveys the history of the modern British press can indeed justify its existence by making such a claim. The last attempt at a comprehensive historical survey of the press was published by H.R. Fox Bourne in 1887; and the methodology as well as the content of press history has advanced since that date.

Like Smith's desire to see film history placed in its social context, the editors of this collection wanted to shift attention from the 'great personalities' approach to press history to one which placed it in relation to 'the underlying social and economic forces that have shaped the press' [103].

By the early 1980s a sense that this area was only in its relative infancy was apparent in the UK and Europe. In the 1980s Briggs noted the gradual shift in broadcasting history:

There are few signs so far of broadcasting history booming, though more monographs are now in preparation than ever before ... and more comparative studies are being undertaken of communications history and policy in different countries.

None the less there was still 'scope for a more systematic discussion of the problems that has so far taken place'. For movement to be made the historian of broadcasting 'must be genuinely interdisciplinary' [104]. From the vantage point of media and cultural studies Paddy Scannell also felt that at the end of the 1970s:

there has been an increasing tendency to conduct debates both on media institutions ... and in the sphere of culture/ideology as variously defined, at a theoretical pitch not solidly underpinned by detailed, empirical historical knowledge.

He also noted the relative lack of studies of the film, music, advertising and press industries [105]. These kinds of considerations about the state of media history and its methods were not confined to the UK. In Denmark, in 1982, Neil Thomsen, in asking 'Why Study Press History?', insisted that 'press history is primarily a part of general history' for the press 'loses any trace of meaning if torn from its time and place'. While

arguing that there 'is not real difference between press and media and communications history, which are just clumsier words for the same thing and not much less ambiguous', he recognized that in Denmark 'the press itself has been the object of far more contributions than the other media' [106]. Swedish press history, according to Gafvert and Torbacke drew on work in a number of disciplines and had, by the 1980s, produced general surveys and in depth studies but had not reached 'the final phase ... the production of new works of synthesis' [107].

While work on media history in the 1980s and 1990s grew, there remained a continuing concern amongst practitioners about its nature and relationship to other areas of study, which has persisted to date. In 1986 Virginia Berridge welcomed the way in which historians of the press were making use of content analysis techniques, drawn from 'the investigations of contemporary mass communications' to develop work on 'the history of the press and in particular on changes and developments in its content' [108]. Asa Briggs, writing in 1990, felt that there was a need for more 'specialised monographs' on broadcasting history, and Paddy Scannell was critical of the way monographs emanating for the more traditional historiographical pastures of 'the solid Oxford PhD in history do not include critical reflection on one's subject' [109]. These problems found an echo in cultural studies approaches, where, in 1991, Carolyn Steedman reiterated the points made by Scannell in the 1980s, when she asserted the need for theory to be accompanied by history, for more 'detailed historical work in cultural studies' [110]. The cross, and interdisciplinary tensions, so characteristic of the area persisted. Briggs, reflecting on these issues, indicated a key dimension to both the contemporary hesitancy around how to study the area and the need for interdisciplinarity:

The fact that the terms 'interdisciplinary' and 'interdisciplinarity' still need to be put between inverted commas is unfortunate. When we try to tackle so-called 'real life' problems ... we cannot make progress without a convergence of disciplinary insights and concepts. [111]

In 1994, Hans Fredrik Dahl pointed to the way the media 'seem to resist historical exploration by their sheer and monotonous insistence on dealing mainly with contemporary moments'. To deal with this an effort of definition was needed, which he tried to supply by arguing that the 'media' is:

both a structure and a system: an entity composed of single parts (newspapers, radio, TV) distinguished by their characteristic relations and positions, and at the same time determined by their interdependence and reciprocity.

In this system discrete media shared patterns of economic connections, as well as ways of influencing each others' content. For Dahl, while communications dealt with the general processes of communication and media with the institutional dimensions, he warned against exaggerating the differences between the two perspectives. He argued that where the abundance of theories in the general area was concerned, they should be treated as 'hypotheses for one's own work', although they had the added advantage of helping to establish contexts for the objects of study [112].

That the boundaries between history, theory media and cultural studies, though under assault, remained in place in the early 1990s was evident. Philip Taylor noted that:

The rise of cultural studies and media studies, too often dominated by theoretical frameworks and concerns which have no contact with the real world of the media has created a new species of scholar that intimidates and irritates most historians.

At the same time he urged historians to take a much more serious approach to the study of media history, for:

traditional diplomatic historians ... have too often failed to appreciate the extent to which the media are actually an integral part of an informed understanding of the foreign policy process. [113]

In 1996 Nick Hiley retold this story from the perspective of a media historian. The history of the media he argued 'is still not accepted as a subject of enquiry in its own right', a fact compounded, as Dahl had pointed out, by problems of definition, and of determining the relative importance of different media. Historians, he stated in a phrase that conjures up John Tosh's views [114] 'tend to study, not the media themselves, but the events which they describe and illustrate'. There was a more urgent dimension to this lack of recognition:

Until the mass media are established as a valid field for historical research—not for their contents or cultural impact, but for their own importance as an industry—the study of the media will remain in its present fragmented state, and the basic records will continue to be destroyed or sold overseas. [115]

Thus commentators from a variety of perspectives recognized a sense in which media history was an ill-defined subject and one that by the 1990s was in need of both being integrated more thoroughly with general history and of reaping the benefits of systematic interdisciplinary research. In 2001 Graham Roberts, in a collection devoted to the relationship between history and television argued for:

the serious multi-disciplinary historical study of television ... this study must begin with a dialogue between practitioners and theorists and indeed should involve theorists who are practitioners and vice versa. [116]

At this point, even given the progress made since the 1960s, in the context of a synoptic study that recognized the vast expansion of work on media history, two of the most experienced explorers in the area, one of whom Asa Briggs, had spent nearly 50 years writing and thinking about the issues, could still argue that:

it is necessary for people working in communication and cultural studies—a still growing number—to take history seriously, as well as for historians—whatever their period and preoccupations—to take serious account of communication (including communications theory). [117]

In retrospect the systematic historical work on the mass media in the UK developed from the late 1950s onwards across a number of established (history, sociology) and newer (media studies) areas of study. The slow recognition amongst historians of the issues associated with media history reflected the methodological conservatism of the profession. This began to breakdown in the 1950s and 1960s, but it has been a slow process, to which the comments of Briggs, Hiley and Taylor testify. The dominance of literary, theoretically driven and often asynchronic models of enquiry in media, cultural and communications studies contributed to the barriers that existed between these areas and history. Across these areas lay disputes about where the methodological emphasis should lay, either towards theory or more empirically orientated approaches. The clear sense, by the 1990s, that in the UK there was something called media history was complicated by problems of definition, methodology and the difficulties of crossing disciplinary boundaries in order to determine an adequate set of interdisciplinary tools for studying the topic. These disciplinary boundaries were as much boundaries between institutional-

ized departments within higher education, where resources and prestige had a tendency to follow established, rather than cross disciplinary, initiatives.

Amidst the various currents traced here a unifying theme can be discerned. By the turn of the twenty-first century, after a great deal of thinking on what was, and how to study, media history, the underlying interdisciplinary nature of the field stood out as the dominant paradigm, not least of all because the objects of study were multi-faceted, evolving social phenomena with wide-ranging implications.

Correspondence: Tom O'Malley, Department of Theatre, Film and Television Studies, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, Wales, UK. E-mail: tpo@aber.ac.uk

NOTES

- [1] Asa Briggs and Peter Burke, *A Social History of the Media. From Gutenberg to the Internet* (Cambridge: Polity, 2002), 358.
- [2] Throughout this article media studies is used as a shorthand for media, cultural and communication studies. This is because, for the period covered these words were used loosely to describe similar, overlapping academic foci and interests. The exception is where a particular point is being made about trends which can best be differentiated by emphasizing differences within the area.
- [3] This article focuses on the relationship between history and media studies. It touches on the influence of literary studies on media studies, but does not discuss, for reasons of focus and space, the role of literary based studies on the development of media history. None the less, studies from academics with a background in literary studies have played a major role in developing the interdisciplinary approaches to media history and some of this work has been published in *Media History* as well as other journals. This article is therefore intended as a contribution to discussions about the development of media history, rather than an exhaustive survey of all the varied currents involved in its development.
- [4] Peter Burke, *History and Social Theory* (Cambridge: Polity, 1994), 3.
- [5] *Ibid.*, 10–11.
- [6] C. Wright Mills, *The Sociological Imagination* (London: Pelican, 1970—first published 1959), 69, 161–62.
- [7] Adam Sisman, *A.J.P. Taylor. A biography* (London: Mandarin, 1995), 338.
- [8] John Goldthorpe, 'Theories of Industrial Society: reflections on the recrudescence of historicism and the future of futurology', *Archives European de Sociologie*, xii (1971), 277.
- [9] Burke, *op. cit.*
- [10] Philip Abrams, 'History, Sociology, Historical Sociology', *Past and Present*, 87 (1980), 4, 15.
- [11] Burke, *op. cit.*, 79.
- [12] For a survey of some of the difficulties with the concept of the public sphere see: James Curran, 'Rethinking the Media as a Public Sphere', in Peter Dahlgren and Colin Sparks, eds, *Communication and Citizenship. Journalism and the public sphere in the new media age* (London: Routledge, 1991), 27–57.
- [13] John Thompson, *The Media and Modernity. A social theory of the media* (Cambridge: Polity, 1995), 268.
- [14] Burke, *op. cit.*
- [15] Nicholas Garnham, *Emancipation, the Media and Modernity. Arguments about the media and social theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 19.
- [16] Briggs and Burke, *op. cit.*
- [17] *Ibid.*, 1.
- [18] Aled Jones, *Powers of the Press. Newspapers, power and the public in nineteenth-century England* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996).
- [19] Briggs and Burke, *op. cit.*, 204–205.
- [20] Anthony Smith, *The Shadow in the Cave. A study of the relationship between the broadcaster, his audience and the State* (London: Quartet, 1976), 8–50.
- [21] Jeffrey Richards, *The Age of the Dream Palace. Cinema and society in Britain 1930–1939* (London: Routledge, 1989), 46–83.
- [22] Asa Briggs, *The Collected Essays of Asa Briggs. Volume II: serious pursuits* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991), 107–108; Briggs and Burke, *op. cit.*, 248.
- [23] David Morrison, *The Search for a Method: focus groups and the development of mass communication*

- research (Luton: University of Luton Press, 1998); Timothy Glander, *Origins of Mass Communications Research during the American Cold War* (Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000).
- [24] Briggs, op. cit., 108.
- [25] Tom Steele, *The Emergence of Cultural Studies 1945–65: cultural politics, adult education and the English question* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1997), 2–3, 9, 15–16, 94.
- [26] Asa Briggs, *The History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom. Volume V. Competition 1955–1974* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 493.
- [27] Michael Pickering, *History, Experience and Cultural Studies* (London: Macmillan, 1997), 2.
- [28] John Corner, 'Studying Culture: reflections and assessments. An interview with Richard Hoggart', *Media, Culture & Society*, 13(2) (1991), 145.
- [29] Briggs and Burke, op. cit., 247; Steele, op. cit., 139.
- [30] Morrison, op. cit., 150.
- [31] Howard Tumber, 'Academic at Work', in Howard Tumber, ed., *Media Power, Professionals and Policies* (London: Routledge, 2000), 1–15.
- [32] Pickering, op. cit., 24.
- [33] Briggs, *Collected Essays*, 64.
- [34] Michael Kenny, *The First New Left. British intellectual after Stalin* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1995).
- [35] Ibid., 98.
- [36] Steele, op. cit., 204–205.
- [37] Raphael Samuel, ed., *People's History and Socialist Theory* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981), 397.
- [38] Briggs and Burke, op. cit., 246.
- [39] Morrison, op. cit., 5.
- [40] Nicholas Garnham, *Capitalism and Communications* (London: Sage, 1990), 62.
- [41] James Curran, 'The New Revisionism in Mass Communication Research: a reappraisal', *European Journal of Communication*, 5(2–3) (1990), 146.
- [42] Curran, 'Rethinking the Media as a Public Sphere', 27.
- [43] Morrison, op. cit.
- [44] Hans Fredrik Dahl, 'The Pursuit of Media History', *Media, Culture & Society*, 16(2) (1994), 561.
- [45] Douglas Kellner, 'Overcoming the Divide: cultural studies and political economy', in Marjorie Ferguson and Peter Golding, eds, *Cultural Studies in Question* (London: Sage, 1997), 102–20.
- [46] Pickering, op. cit., 1.
- [47] Morrison, op. cit., 153.
- [48] Andrew Milner, *Class* (London: Sage, 1999), 173.
- [49] Garnham, *Emancipation*, 38.
- [50] Margaret Dickinson and Sarah Street, *Cinema and State. The film industry and the British Government 1927–84* (London: British Film Institute, 1985); Asa Briggs, *The History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom. Volume I. The birth of broadcasting* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961); *ibid.*, *The History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom. Volume II. The golden age of wireless* (London: Oxford University Press, 1965).
- [51] Tom O'Malley, 'Labour and the 1947–9 Royal Commission on the Press', in Michael Bromley and Tom O'Malley, eds, *A Journalism Reader* (London: Routledge, 1997), 126–58; James Curran, 'Press Reformism 1981–98. A study of failure', in Howard Tumber, ed., *Media Power, Professionals and Policies* (London: Routledge, 2000), 35–55.
- [52] O'Malley, op. cit., 144–46.
- [53] Briggs, *History of Broadcasting, Volume V*, 25.
- [54] Asa Briggs, 'Problems and Possibilities in the Writing of Broadcasting History', *Media, Culture & Society*, 2(1) (1980), 6.
- [55] *Ibid.*, *History of Broadcasting, Volume V*, 183, 242.
- [56] Home Office, *Report of the Committee on Broadcasting 1960* (London: HMSO, 1974, Cmnd.1753—first published 1962).
- [57] Corner, 'Studying Culture', 148.
- [58] Kenny, op. cit., 104–105.
- [59] Home Office, op. cit., 329.
- [60] Steele, op. cit., 184–85.
- [61] Briggs, *Collected Essays*, 61.
- [62] *Ibid.*, *History of Broadcasting, Volume V*, 787.

- [63] Ibid.; Tumber, op. cit.; James Curran, Jake Ecclestone, Giles Oakley and Alan Richardson, eds, *Bending Reality. The state of the media* (London: Pluto, 1986).
- [64] Steele, op. cit., 7.
- [65] Tom O'Malley, *Closedown? The BBC and government broadcasting policy 1979–92* (London: Pluto, 1994); Peter Goodwin, *Television Under the Tories* (London: British Film Institute, 1998).
- [66] *Idem*, for discussion of the origins and impacts of the 1990 Broadcasting Act, which, among other things, significantly increased the role of commercial forces in UK terrestrial TV and radio.
- [67] Corner, 'Studying Culture', 149.
- [68] Jim McGuigan, *Cultural Populism* (London: Routledge, 1992), 162–63.
- [69] Milner, op. cit., 173.
- [70] Thompson, op. cit., 268.
- [71] John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History*, 3rd edn (Harlow: Longman, 2000), ix, 34.
- [72] Michael Bentley, *Modern Historiography. An introduction* (London: Routledge, 1999), 146.
- [73] Ibid., 11; Briggs and Burke, op. cit., 19.
- [74] Burke, op. cit., 7.
- [75] Bentley, op. cit., 53, 60–61.
- [76] Ibid., 62–70.
- [77] Tosh, op. cit., 74.
- [78] Briggs and Burke, op. cit., 198.
- [79] John Carey, *The Intellectuals and the Masses* (London: Faber, 1992).
- [80] Tosh, op. cit., 138–39; G.R. Elton, *The Practice of History* (London: Fontana, 1970), 21.
- [81] Christopher Hill, *History and the Present: the 65th Conway Memorial Lecture* (London: South Place Ethical Society, 1989), 14.
- [82] Ibid., 16; Steele, op. cit.
- [83] Briggs, 'Problems and Possibilities', 8.
- [84] Burke, op. cit.; Bentley, op. cit.; Tosh, op. cit.
- [85] Kenny, op. cit.
- [86] For example: Briggs, *History of Broadcasting Volume I*; George Boyce, James Curran and Pauline Wingate, eds, *Newspaper History from the 17th Century to the Present Day* (London: Constable, 1978); Elizabeth Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); Past and Present Society, *The Transmission of Ideas in Early Modern Europe c.1350–1700. Abstracts of papers presented at the Annual Conference 4 July 1979* (Oxford: Past and Present Society, 1979).
- [87] Bentley, op. cit., 142–51.
- [88] Briggs, *Collected Essays*, 1.
- [89] Tosh, op. cit., 37–39, 42–43; see also, Martha Howell and Walter Prevenier, *From Reliable Sources: an introduction to historical methods* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001), 28–33.
- [90] Boyce *et al.*, op. cit.
- [91] Briggs, *Collected Essays*, 212.
- [92] Philip Taylor, 'Television and the Future Historian', in Graham Roberts and Philip Taylor, eds, *The Historian, Television and Television History* (Luton: University of Luton Press, 2001), 175.
- [93] Paul Smith, 'Introduction', in Paul Smith, ed., *The Historian and Film* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 5.
- [94] Briggs, *Collected Essays*, 38.
- [95] *Idem*, 'Problems and Possibilities', 6, 8 and *History of Broadcasting Volume I*, 5.
- [96] Briggs, *Collected Essays*, 66–67.
- [97] Graham Roberts, 'The Historian and Television—a methodological survey', in Graham Roberts and Philip Taylor, eds, *The Historian, Television and Television History* (Luton: University of Luton Press, 2001), 1.
- [98] Christopher Roads, 'Film as Historical Evidence', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 3(4) (1966), 183.
- [99] Briggs, *Collected Essays*, 223–25.
- [100] Smith, op. cit., 1, 3, 8, 11.
- [101] Donald Watt, 'History on the Public Screen', in Paul Smith, ed., *The Historian and Film* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 170.
- [102] Briggs, *Collected Essays*, 28–29, 41.
- [103] Boyce *et al.*, op. cit., 13.
- [104] Briggs, 'Problems and Possibilities', 10, 12.
- [105] Paddy Scannell, 'Editorial: history and culture', *Media, Culture & Society*, 2(1) (1980), 1–2.

- [106] Neil Thomsen, 'Why Study Press History? A re-examination of its purpose and of Danish contributions', *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 7(1) (1982), 1–2, 10.
- [107] E.S. Gafvert and J. Torbacke, 'Hundred Years of Swedish Press History', *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 7(1) (1982), 31, 46.
- [108] Virginia Berridge, 'Content Analysis and Historical Research on Newspapers', in Michael Harris and Alan Lee, eds, *The Press in English Society from the Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries* (London: Associated University Press, 1986), 204.
- [109] Briggs, *Collected Essays*, 226; Paddy Scannell, 'Book Review', *Media, Culture & Society*, 12(4) (1990), 565.
- [110] Carolyn Steedman, 'Culture, Cultural Studies and the Historians', in Simon During, ed., *The Cultural Studies Reader*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 1999), 55.
- [111] Briggs, *Collected Essays*, 5.
- [112] Dahl, op. cit., 552, 554, 557, 561.
- [113] Philip Taylor, 'Back to the Future? Integrating the press and media into the history of international relations', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 14(3) (1994), 321, 328; see also, Taylor, 'Television and the Future Historian'.
- [114] Tosh, op. cit.
- [115] Nicholas Hiley, 'The Problems of Media History', *Modern History Review*, 7(4) (1996), 17–19.
- [116] Roberts, op. cit., 2.
- [117] Briggs and Burke, op. cit., 2.